



THE NEW US 31 HAMILTON COUNTY

MEETING NOTES

DATE/TIME: February 15, 2008

FILE CODE: 0710215 –US 31 Hamilton County

LOCATION: Conseco Conference Center

SUBJECT: CAC Meeting #2

ATTENDEES: CAC Members

NOTES BY: US 31 Hamilton County Team Members

PURPOSE: To inform CAC members of the proposed upgrades along the corridor for the US 31 Hamilton County project and to update them on the status of the road project. Participants were encouraged to express comment and concerns, all of which will be addressed by the team.

DISCUSSION: The US 31 Hamilton County project team discussed three interchange locations and possible interchange types at these locations. Environmental concerns at each interchange were also presented. Noise wall analysis and CSS image preferencing were introduced. A brief overview of the mainline profile status was presented.

ACTIONS: CAC members were asked to share their comments and concerns with US 31 Hamilton County team members.

Meeting Overview: The second Community Advisory Committee meeting was held on Friday, Feb. 15, 2008 at Conseco in Carmel. More than 45 community members and US Hamilton County team members attended.

General Information:

- Jennifer Dzwonar, Public Outreach lead, opened the meeting shortly after 8 a.m. with a welcome and introduction.
- She explained the purpose of this meeting which is to update CAC members on the current state of the project and to inform members of three preliminary interchanges at 131st Street, 161st Street and 191st Street, noise policy, traffic updates and CSS input.
- Jennifer informed the members that the website will be uploaded with the preliminary designs being discussed today. CAC members were encouraged to visit the website, beginning Feb. 25, to share the information with others.

POWERPOINT PRESENTATION:

US 31 Hamilton County

Updated Traffic Analysis

- Dave Henkel, Traffic Analysis Coordinator, explained that RW Armstrong is working with INDOT to more accurately analyze traffic flow in the corridor. The projections will be developed for the year 2015 (construction year) and 2035 (design year).
- Models have been developed from the existing data collected to get traffic forecasts for construction

and design years. It is necessary to develop a capacity analysis to see where to make improvements and where best to alleviate traffic concerns.

- Dave explained the team is currently analyzing traffic along the mainline and they expect to identify deficiencies and determine refinements. Dave explained the team is currently determining the Level of Service, due to INDOT by the end of February. Final recommendations of trouble points are due to INDOT by the end of April.
- Dave explained that the traffic data gathering process started in summer 2007 and ended in fall 2007. The analysis covered areas from 86th Street to 216th.
- Between the analysis in 2000 and 2007, the data has shown a significant increase in traffic at the south end of the corridor, and that traffic north of State Road 32 is consistent with that of seven years ago.
- The models are complete and have been submitted and approved by INDOT as of January 2008. The models give projections that will help discover capacity analysis.

Introduction to Interchanges

- Dave Henkel explained the interchange type selection criteria. This information can be found on the website in the Interchange Design Options section.
- Dave defined the interchange types that are being considered for the project, and the advantages and disadvantages to each type of interchange. The types discussed were: diamond, folded diamond, full cloverleaf, partial cloverleaf, roundabout, and system-to-system.

Preliminary Interchange: 131st Street

- Steve Swango, a lead designer, discussed the three design interchanges for 131st Street and explained that all three intersections can go over or under US 31. The graphics represent 131st over US 31.
- The first option is the tight diamond. Steve explained the advantages and disadvantages to this type of interchange.
- The second option is the roundabout. Steve explained the advantages and disadvantages to this type of interchange.
- The third option is the single-point urban interchange (SPUI). Steve explained the advantages and disadvantages of this type of interchange.
- Steve explained these interchanges are preliminary and that the recommended design will be presented to the CAC again in two months, prior to submitting to INDOT for the Record of Decision.
- Jason Hignite discussed the environmental impacts in this area.

Preliminary Interchange: 161st Street

- Steve Fleming, Project Manager, discussed the two different options for 161st Street.
- The first option is the tight diamond. Steve explained the advantages and disadvantages of this type of type of interchange.
- The second option is the tear drop roundabout and explained the advantages and disadvantages of this type of interchange.
- Steve explained the commitment by INDOT to have a trail along the corridor.
- Jason Hignite discussed the environmental impacts in this area. Jason explained that more information can be found on the website, as well as information about land acquisition.

Preliminary Interchange: 191st Street

- Dustin Quincy, a lead designer, discussed the two different options for 191st Street.
- The first option is the tight diamond. Dustin explained the advantages and disadvantages of the first option. He noted that 191st would be shifted slightly north.
- The second option is the folded diamond with roundabouts at the terminals. Dustin described the advantages and disadvantages to this type of interchange.
- A question was asked about the land inside the loop. The INDOT team confirmed the land will belong to the state and would not be for commercial development.
- Jason Hignite explained the environmental impacts for this interchange. He explained that these two options will have impact on displacements and that the information in full is displayed on the website.

Mainline Profile

- Kelli McNamara, a lead designer, discussed the criteria for developing under and over passes. The profile for the corridor is not yet set but the team is working toward making recommendations to INDOT.
- Kelli commented that it doesn't appear that the road will be depressed substantially, due to the gravity drainage points. Moving forward, the team is working toward a preferred alternative that will take into consideration design standards, gravity drainage outlets, impacts to adjacent property, and cost comparisons.
- Jason discussed the environmental impact associated with the mainline profile. Impacts to this project, among others include residential, commercial, well-head protection zones, flood plains and streams.

Public Presentations

- There will be a public hearing this summer and a 45-day comment period following. All comments will be on public record and will lead toward a Record of Decision.

Noise Policy

- Tim Selover, noise policy specialist, provided some background on common noise levels and noise impact.
- He explained that traffic noise is averaged over an hour time period because noise can fluctuate so rapidly. He also explained how traffic volume and speed can affect noise.
- Tim gave an overview of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement noise analysis completed in 2003.
- Tim explained INDOT's new noise policy and explained the need to re-evaluate noise levels due to the rapid change in noise of the past four years.
- Tim explained the options used to eliminate noise and explained that noise barriers are the most common type.

Context Sensitive Systems (CSS)

- Jonathan Mooney explained the concept of context sensitive solutions (CSS).
- The CAC members were asked to provide comments on what CSS designs and structures they found appealing. Based on the CAC input, the urban planning and design team will move forward with

establishing various CSS targets. The design options will be reasonable and feasible.

- Jonathan will revisit a CAC meeting to present some options for CSS.

Conclusion:

- Meeting attendees were asked to submit their comments and concerns about environmental, traffic, and planning factors – on comment cards, via email, via follow-up meetings – for the US 31 Team to take into consideration.
- The meeting was adjourned at 10 a.m.